

step toward balancing the budget of the United States, the thing to do today would be to say, OK, we have to give some with regard to the defense budget, because the defense budget, obviously, with its vast multibillion-dollar increase, while we are reducing the real needs of Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment and other programs, flies in the face of reality.

Another way to put that, Mr. President, would be to say this is a chance for people who preach fiscal discipline, who want a balanced budget by the year 2002, who want a constitutional amendment to guarantee that by the year 2002, with this modest amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska and others to practice what they preach.

There have been some things said today in this Chamber during this debate about Admiral Boorda, our late and dear colleague, who was very close to this particular Senator. The statement has been made that Admiral Boorda was asked what more money could he use as head of the Navy if he had it.

That is like saying to a military leader, is there anything at all that you would like to have if you had a blank check?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator's 8 minutes have expired.

Mr. EXON. Have I used up my time? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. EXON. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. I simply say that Admiral Boorda or any other military leader, given such an opportunity, would be derelict in his duty, it seems to me, if he could not come up with some concept or idea. That is the wish list that I talked about earlier.

The last time I saw Admiral Boorda was shortly before his death when he came to my office. I said, "What can I do for you, admiral?" He said, "You can't do anything for me, Senator. I just want to thank you for the great support that you have given the U.S. Navy all of these years."

So I do not propose to speak for Admiral Boorda, but I simply say that I think Admiral Boorda, when he signed onto the real needs of the Navy, meant just what he said. And I suspect that if Admiral Boorda were here, he would say that you should take a close look, Senators, at adding \$9 billion over what myself and other members of the Joint Chiefs recommended as incorporated in the President's budget.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 19, 1996, to myself, Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator KOHL, from the Taxpayers for Common Sense in support of the Exon amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYERS FOR COMMON SENSE,
June 19, 1996.

Hon. JAMES EXON,
Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Hon. HERB KOHL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

SENATORS EXON, BINGAMAN AND KOHL: Taxpayers for Common Sense is pleased to support your amendments to the FY 97 defense authorization bill to cut the overall level of defense spending by \$4 billion. With Congress working to reduce the deficit, this cut is a fair compromise on the defense budget.

The Department of Defense (DOD) bill authorizes \$13 billion in budget authority above the President's request. It seems questionable to offer such a large increase to the budget of an agency whose accounting systems and practices are so weak. In 1995, the DOD Comptroller gave up trying to find \$15 billion in "missing" DOD funds. Government investigations have revealed that out of 36 Pentagon agencies audited last year, 28 of them used records "in such terrible condition" that their financial statements were "utterly useless."

Every agency is being asked to examine its own budget and implement effective spending strategies. In light of the fact that \$4.6 billion of the Committee's \$13 billion increase was not in the Future Years Defense Plan, a \$4 billion cut merely attempts to bring the defense budget in line with all the other agencies.

Taxpayers for Common Sense supports your efforts in working toward a balanced budget. This amendment is the first step toward fiscal responsibility for the Pentagon. We urge all members of the Senate to support your amendments.

Sincerely,

RALPH DEGENNARO,
Executive Director.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator THURMOND is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. THURMOND. At this time, I ask unanimous-consent that yesterday's agreement on minimum wage be further modified to allow for the two leaders to void this agreement up until the hour of 5:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. I am sorry; I could not hear the Senator.

What was the unanimous consent request, I ask my friend from South Carolina, to do what at 5:15?

Mr. THURMOND. To allow for the two leaders to void this agreement up until the hour of 5:30 p.m. today.

Mr. EXON. I have no objection. I thank my friend from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. May I inquire of the Chair as to the anticipated procedures? I understand we are stacking votes until sometime to be determined later by the two leaders. I assume that the next order of business under the unanimous-consent agreement would be the amendment to be offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the ranking member with 20 minutes equally divided. Is that now the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4346

(Purpose: To reduce the total funding authorized in the bill for the national defense function to the level provided in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1997)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator NUNN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], for himself and Mr. NUNN, proposes an amendment numbered 4346.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

After section 3, add the following:

SEC. 4. GENERAL LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the national defense function under the provisions of this Act is \$265,583,000,000.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this amendment recognizes that the Defense authorization bill is currently \$1.7 billion over the amounts provided for in the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1997, and reduces the spending authorizations in this bill to comply with the budget resolution.

Mr. President, the committee finished its markup of the Defense authorization bill prior to the budget resolution being resolved and even before the Senate version was passed. This amendment reduces the spending amounts authorized in this bill to be in compliance with the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution.

It is a simple amendment. Senator NUNN and I ask for our colleagues' support. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, Senator THURMOND. We are offering this amendment to reduce the overall funding level in this bill to comply with the budget resolution.

Although the authorization bill is not technically required to conform to the budget resolution, our committee has always tried to conform its recommendations to the budget resolution, to the maximum extent possible, in order to keep our work relevant to the overall process and to give firmer guidance to the appropriations bill.

This amendment lowers the national defense total funding authorized in this bill by \$1.8 billion, to a level providing for the national defense function contained in the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution of \$265.583 billion.

This amendment is in the form of an overall reduction. It does not attempt to amend the bill in the dozens of places that would be necessary to make all the detailed reductions, nor does it spell out the even more numerous changes to all the line items in the report language but which are not part of the bill. In my view, that kind of procedure is not necessary or productive at this time.

This amendment ensures, however, that the total authorized for defense in this bill matches the budget resolution. The committee will make the appropriate detailed adjustments during our conference negotiations.

Mr. President, I will just take a brief period here to explain how we got to this point. The answer is simple. When we marked up our bill, there was no 1997 budget resolution number to mark to—no House number, no Senate number, no conference number. Our colleagues in the House were in the same situation. Their bill was reported and brought to the floor even earlier than this bill was. The House did not lower their version of this authorization bill on the floor to comply with the budget resolution. Their bill passed the House on May 15, before the budget resolution had gone to conference or even passed the Senate. The House bill exceeds the final defense spending level in the budget resolution by \$1.1 billion in budget authority and eight-tenths of a billion in outlays. This armed services bill was ordered reported on May 2, while the Senate version of the 1997 budget resolution was not ordered reported until May 9.

Because this bill was marked up before there was a Senate budget resolu-

tion or a House budget resolution defense number for 1997, we used the target for fiscal 1997 from last year's fiscal budget resolution, which was \$267.3 billion in budget authority. It was the only funding target available for us to use. Furthermore, although the House version, like the Senate version, was reported after our Senate Armed Services Committee markup was completed, the defense number in the House version of this year's budget resolution was \$267.2 billion in budget authority and was also consistent with the guidance from last year. In other words, we had two different numbers from the House and Senate that had to be reconciled in conference.

Even after we did get the top line funding targets from the Budget Committees, we still had no definitive guidance about what our number would be. Since one of those two targets was basically what we had marked to, there was at least a chance we were already at the right number. So it did not make sense to try to change it before the budget resolution conference was concluded. So it was not until the budget resolution conference completed it on June 7, and adopted it on June 13, that we knew what the defense number would be. The budget resolution conferees adopted the Senate's defense number. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the national defense authorization level in our bill was equivalent to \$267.4 billion in budget authority and compared to the budget resolution's budget authority level for national defense of \$265.6 billion. That means our bill is over the budget resolution conference by \$1.779 billion in budget authority, although it is right on target in terms of outlays, or actual cash. Because our bill was sequentially referred to the Intelligence Committee, which reported it out on June 11, for all practical purposes, we had no way to redo the bill before it came to the floor.

Mr. President, I have explained why it is impractical, if not impossible, to redo our bill to comply with the budget resolution before considering this bill on the Senate floor. However, this amendment will bring the bill into compliance with the budget resolution number.

This amendment would reduce the amount in the bill by \$1.8 billion. The bill would be \$11.2 billion above the President's budget request, but, again, will be lower than last year's bill and last year's defense total in real terms. So the defense budget is still coming down, in real terms, and this amendment will not change that.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the Thurmond-Nunn amendment, and I also urge the Senate to vote against the Exon amendment, which cuts more substantially than does the Thurmond-Nunn amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest we yield back the time, and we will do so on our side.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I yield back all the time we may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4347

(Purpose: To restore funding for certain educational and employment assistance programs to levels requested by the President in authorizing the Secretary of Defense to transfer defense funds that are excess to the funding levels provided in the future-years defense program and to other funding objectives of the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am going to, in a moment, send an amendment to the desk in behalf of myself, Senator BUMPERS, Senator BOXER, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator HARKIN, and Senator WYDEN. We may have other cosponsors to add.

I send an amendment to the desk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself, Mr. BUMPERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 4347.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X add the following:

SEC. ____ TRANSFERS FOR EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997 pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations contained in this Act, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of Education—

(1) \$577,000,000, to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a), relating to Federal Pell Grants;

(2) \$158,000,000, to carry out part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa et seq.), relating to Federal Perkins Loans; and

(3) \$71,000,000, to carry out part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq.), relating to Federal Direct Stafford/Ford Loans.

(b) EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997 pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations contained in this Act, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of Labor—

(1) \$193,000,000, to provide employment and training assistance to dislocated workers under title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1651 et seq.);

(2) \$246,000,000, to carry out summer youth employment and training programs under part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1630 et seq.);

(3) \$25,000,000, to carry out School-to-Work Opportunities programs under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.); and

(4) \$40,000,000, to carry out activities, including activities provided through one-stop centers, under the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this amendment takes a small part of the over \$13 billion more authorized for the Pentagon than the Pentagon requested, and out of this figure—initially it was \$13 billion and now after adoption of the Nunn-Thurmond amendment it will be about \$11 billion—this amendment transfers by way of authorization \$1.3 billion. In other words, out of the original \$13 billion—that is over what the Pentagon says it needs for our defense, now pared down a little bit—this amendment would take \$1.3 billion and transfer that to a number of different key education and job retraining programs.

I am going to spend most of my time talking about higher education, because when I think about what regular people talk about I can tell you right now that in Minnesota, families are talking about the cost of higher education and how it can be more affordable for their children or their grandchildren, or for themselves.

This amendment restores funding to the level authorized by the President for the following programs: Pell grants, \$577 million—Perkins loans, \$158 million; direct student loans, \$71 million. So the higher education total is about \$806 million.

In addition, there are some other programs that we want to at least get back to the level of authorization in the President's proposal. Dislocated workers, \$193 million; summer youth jobs, \$246 million; School-to-Work, \$25 million; and One-Stop Job Training Centers, \$40 million.

I do not think it is too much to ask, given the priorities of regular people, of families across the country, that we transfer \$193 million out of an overstuffed military budget, for dislocated workers; that is to say, men and women who are out of work because of plant closings, out of work because of restructuring and downsizing. This is the story of America. People can work hard all their lives and all of a sudden find themselves out of work.

I am saying, what are we doing as I look at what the House has now proposed, cutting funding for dislocated workers? What kind of a distorted priority is that?

Summer youth jobs: This is a program that has had strong bipartisan support for a good many years. We cannot restore \$246 million for the whole Nation for summer youth jobs?

Again, I want Senators who are going to vote on this amendment to understand how modest this proposal is. I am talking about taking just \$246 million and restoring the authorization level that the President requested to where it was, \$246 million more than had been cut from summer youth jobs.

Senators, if we are concerned about young people, if we are concerned

about the violence in our communities, then we have to have positive alternatives for young people.

When I talk to people who are working in their communities and are down in the trenches dealing with problems of violence, problems of recidivism, and problems of young people, they put a strong emphasis on summer job programs.

School-to-Work: A sum total of \$25 million. This puts students in, if you will, real life situations. It connects the schooling to a work experience. It is enormously successful.

We had testimony in the Labor and Human Resources Committee from labor, from business, from people in metropolitan communities, from people in rural communities, all saying that the School-to-Work Program is a huge success. What are we doing cutting opportunity programs for children in America?

Finally, One-Stop Job Training Centers, \$40 million we want to restore—\$40 million for a program, again, that has been enormously successful in Minnesota, with my State among those, by the way, taking the lead, eliminating a lot of the duplication, eliminating a lot of the bureaucracy and providing a job training program that makes sense for our citizens who are anxious to be retrained and to find employment.

I thought that was what it was all about—employment opportunities for Americans, employment opportunities for Minnesotans, employment opportunities for men and women in our country.

Mr. President, that is a total of \$504 million for key job training efforts. I am talking about programs that work, that have a proven track record. I am talking about the fact that we do not or ought not to cut into assistance for dislocated workers. We ought not to cut summer youth job programs. We ought not to cut the School-to-Work Program, and we ought not to cut job training programs. These are distorted priorities.

We do not know what the Senate appropriators are going to do yet in these areas. But we look at the House, and we already see where they are heading. They just do not get it. Well, this amendment is an effort to prompt the U.S. Senate to now speak on this question, and hopefully to temper the passions of extremists in the House who would slash these programs.

Mr. President, let me talk about higher education and provide some context first.

In terms of education funding, just looking from 1992 to 1997, which is a critical period of time that we ought to look at, the time the President came in until now, what you had was from 1994 to fiscal year 1995 small increases for funding for education across the board, higher education being the main piece for the Federal Government.

But starting in fiscal year 1995 with the rescissions bill, and then with this year's appropriations bill and the fiscal

year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 budget resolutions, each year since the new majority came in we have seen a percentage cut in the Federal commitment to education. For example, in the Federal commitment to title I, a program that gives kids that come from difficult backgrounds an opportunity; cuts in vocational education; cuts in School-to-Work; cuts in Head Start; cuts in Pell grants; cuts in low-interest loan programs; cuts in direct student loan programs.

Mr. President, these are distorted priorities, and this amendment is but a small step to restore about \$1.3 billion—\$1.3 billion—from what was an original overrun of \$13 billion, likely soon to be about \$11.5 billion. Just take one-tenth—10 percent—of this additional expenditure of money that the Pentagon did not ask for, take 10 percent of it and invest it in education, take 10 percent of it and invest it in programs that benefit dislocated workers, invest it in job training, invest it in summer youth programs. I do not know how the Senate can vote no. This is such a clear priority to me.

Mr. President, these education cuts deny opportunity to young people and, as a matter of fact, not so young people, since many of our college students, community college students are 40, 45 when they go back to school. I thought that we were all about expanding opportunities. Well, this is an effort to at least restore some semblance of funding to higher education.

Newsweek, April 29, 1996, had a jarring front page:

\$1,000 a week
The Scary Cost of College

Private college, not every week of the year, but tuition, room and board and other expenses, \$1,000 a week. Senators, if you do not think this is not a middle-class issue, if you do not think the cost of higher education does not cut across a broad spectrum of the population, and if you do not think a vast majority of people in cafes all across Minnesota and all across this country do not believe it appropriate to take just \$1.3 billion out of a bloated military budget to cover the cost of higher education—Pell grants, low interest Perkins loan program, or the direct loan program—then I just think you're making a huge mistake.

Look at this next chart. "The Price of Public Universities." We talked about private universities. "Average total expenses estimated for a 4-year public education." Just looking at the costs from 1980 to 1996, costs went from \$6,000 to \$9,000, in constant 1996 dollars—\$6,000 average cost for a 4-year public education, higher education, now up to \$9,000, the price of public universities.

Senators, this is why so many of the students that I meet in Minnesota take 5 or 6 or 7 years to graduate, because they are working two and three minimum wage jobs to cover the costs, and the financial aid package they get by way of Pell grants and the Perkins loan program does not cover it.

I have said it before and I will say it again. I meet students over and over and over again that take 6 years to graduate because they are having to work 35 and 40 hours a week because we are not doing our job here. We have not responded.

We have not responded to the basic concern of families in Michigan, in Minnesota and across the country because what they are saying to us is, if there is a role for the public sector and a role for Government, it certainly is in making sure higher education is affordable.

Next chart.

This is "Growth in Per Capita Personal Income v. Tuition and Fees." Community colleges, as you look at this from 1978-79 to 1994-95, this period of time, for community colleges tuition fees have gone up 239 percent, per capita personal income 159 percent; technical colleges have gone up 416 percent, per capita personal income 159 percent; State universities have gone up 200 percent. The University of Minnesota has gone up 178 percent.

So the point is that what we have is a situation where for the vast majority of families in Minnesota and in the country this is a huge economic squeeze. It is imperative that we provide some assistance. And this amendment says that if you are going to look at what our priorities ought to be, we should take at least \$1.3 billion out of the Pentagon budget, with an authorization soon to be about \$11 or \$11.5 billion more than requested, we can take 10 percent of that and transfer that funding to at least provide more assistance in the form of Pell grants, low interest loans, summer job programs, and so on.

Mr. President, just look at the Federal Pell grant awards from 1973-74 to 1994-95. In 1975-76, the actual maximum award of a Pell grant was \$3,649, in real dollar terms. It is now down to \$2,268.

So what happens with most students is that as they look at their financial aid packages, they get very little by way of grants, and middle-class families feel this more than anybody. If you are low income, you at least are going to be able to obtain some grant assistance. If you are wealthy and high income, you can pay for it, your family can pay for it. But for the bottom 80 percent of the population or certainly those people who are in the huge middle, they are fast becoming unable to afford higher education.

What this amendment says, one more time, is that out of the total Pentagon budget, now authorized at over \$13 billion more than the Pentagon even says it needs, we should be able to transfer \$1.3 billion to at least get the Pell grants, to get the Perkins low interest loans, to get the direct student loans, to get school-to-work, to get summer youth jobs, to get key job training programs up to the authorization level the President requested. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I designed this amendment as a very moderate approach, and

I am hoping to get widespread support for it. I do think this amendment represents a little bit of a test case as to what our priorities are all about, because it does seem to me that the vast majority of people in the country have spoken. They have spoken in polls, they speak to us when we have town meetings back in our States, they come up and talk to us when we are in cafes. All the time, people are coming up and they are saying, "If you want to do one thing, Senator, that would really help my family, please try to make higher education more affordable."

This amendment does exactly that. It is only a small step. It only transfers \$1.3 billion out of a total defense budget of \$267 billion. I would argue that affordable higher education is in our national security interests. Students having opportunities is in our national security interests. Investment in education is in our national security interests. Providing a little more funding for the Pell Grant Program is in our national security interests.

Out of a \$267 billion budget authorization for the Pentagon, with all the reports that we have had about the waste and the inefficiencies and the moneys that can be saved, we cannot transfer \$1.3 billion for education? That is what this amendment is all about. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. Other Senators may be down here to speak. I reserve the remainder of my time to follow up on what my colleagues might say on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Wellstone amendment, which would reduce defense spending to below the budget resolution.

Let me be clear, Mr. President. The amendment that has been offered is really a nullification of the Budget Committees' recommended increase to the President's budget request. I believe that the Budget Committee has acted wisely and prudently in recommending an increase to the President's inadequate request for defense.

In order to buy the same level of national security in 1997 as we did in 1996, the defense budget would have to be \$273 billion. The President's request is \$18.6 billion below this. The Budget resolution proposes to increase the budget for defense by \$11.2 billion; therefore, we are still \$7.4 billion lower than the fiscal year 1996 level of funding in real terms. Does the Senator from Minnesota believe that our Armed Forces will be asked to do less in fiscal year 1997 than they did in fiscal year 1996?

The question we should be asking, therefore, is not whether we should be reducing the defense budget even further. Rather the question should be: What additional risks are we taking by not increasing the defense budget to

the \$273 billion necessary to maintain the fiscal year 1996 level of military capability? Our Nation's top military leaders answer that question.

General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, says he is "very concerned that our procurement accounts are not where they ought to be."

General Reimer, Army Chief of Staff, says that "further deferral of modernization will incur significant risk to future readiness."

Admiral Boorda, former Chief of Naval Operations, said: "If we do not modernize, we ultimately place future readiness at risk."

General Fogleman, Air Force Chief of Staff, says that "Unless we recapitalize, we are not going to be ready to meet the threats of the future."

And General Krulak, Marine Corps Commandant, says that: "The Marine Corps * * * cannot absorb further reductions without sacrificing critical core capabilities."

Even Secretary of Defense Perry admits that without an immediate increase in modernization—of which procurement is the major part—"we will start to have a real problem." Mr. President, when our top civilian and military leaders use terms such as "very concerned," "significant risk," "critical" and "real problem" in open testimony, one can only imagine what their private assessments would be.

Our defense needs are underfunded, from both a historical and operational point of view. We are at the lowest level of defense spending since 1950. Procurement has been reduced by 70 percent since 1985, and by more than 40 percent under the Clinton administration. Programs to support our service men and women's quality of life are inadequate. Our ability to protect our soldiers from ballistic missile attacks suffers from lack of funding and commitment. Our military research and development is anemic. If anything, we should be considering amendments which provide floors—not ceilings—on defense funding.

I realize that our great Nation has numerous domestic and international obligations. But none—I repeat, none—of these obligations rises to the level of our responsibility to provide for the common defense. Protection of our Nation's citizens is the Federal Government's first order of business. Without meeting this paramount obligation, the basic guarantees of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness can easily become empty promises.

Defense spending is now at its lowest level in the second half of this century. This half century has been the era of American superpower status. Our superpower status is not something we can maintain cheaply. We won the cold war through our steadfastness and robust military capabilities. Yet, we are asked by the administration and supporters of this amendment to continue undermining our military capabilities.

I hope the Members of the Senate will agree with me that we cannot afford for our Nation to be less vigilant,

less capable, and less ready. I strongly urge the Senate to vote against the Wellstone amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I will not make long remarks. I endorse the remarks made by my colleague and chairman of the committee, Senator THURMOND.

I would also say, in all deference to my good friend, Senator WELLSTONE, this is a debate that we have had already this year. That was on the budget resolution. This is shifting money from the defense account to the education account. I am a strong supporter of education. I have been a strong supporter of education since I have been in the Senate. I think some of the recommendations from the majority side, both the House and Senate, have been much too severe on education. I applaud President Clinton's strong stand on behalf of education.

But that debate is over for this year. We have already decided the budget resolution. This would revisit the budget resolution and would reverse the basic allocations made after a large and long debate on the budget resolution, so I urge defeat of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, just a quick response to the Senator from South Carolina, whom I consider to be a good friend. I say this out of friendship. This amendment would not necessarily mean that we would be below the budget resolution because the amendment that he and Senator NUNN have introduced has not been agreed to yet.

So it is not quite the case yet. But, more important, Mr. President, out of \$267 billion, we cannot find \$1.3 billion when you have the Pentagon's own spending watchdog saying last year they concluded they did not even know how they spent \$13 billion, did not even know what happened to the money, and you are saying to me that we cannot find \$1.3 billion to restore some funding for Pell grants, to restore some funding for Perkins low-interest loans, to restore funding so higher education is more affordable, to restore some funding for dislocated workers, for the School-to-Work Program, for the summer jobs program?

I think it is just a distorted priority. I am tempted to ask my colleagues from every State, Democrats and Republicans alike, don't you find students that are just having an impossible time affording their college education?

Don't you have parents coming up to you and saying, "Can't you do something to make sure higher education is more affordable?"

Don't you find that in your States, there are all sorts of students who are not receiving the grants and the loans that they need?

Don't you find that educational opportunities are being narrowed for your citizens?

Don't you believe that this goes against the national interest for our country?

Don't you think that the citizens back in your States, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, believe it is a reasonable proposition that we can take \$1.3 billion out of a \$267 billion authorization and transfer that so we can do a little bit better by way of supporting education; that we can take \$1.3 billion—that is about 10 percent of the additional \$11 billion that is over what the Pentagon even asked for, and less than 1 percent of the overall defense budget—and put it into education? I mean, I think that regular people believe that this amendment is eminently reasonable. I think the vast majority of citizens in this country believe that to be the case.

Look, we heard all this discussion about a strong defense, and I admire my colleagues. I do not think there is anybody in the Senate who does not defer to Senator NUNN when it comes to his expertise, his commitment to our national security. His retirement from the Senate is a huge loss for the country. But I also know that we continue to have some of these problems of add-on projects, accelerating expenditures of money for weapons systems, some of which could be obsolete.

By spending far more than the Pentagon requested, we are prejudging the major study that we all voted for yesterday, to really look at our force structure and to really look at modernization and a host of other issues. There is pork in this bill. There are special projects for Senators back in their States. There is waste and inefficiency in this bill, and out of \$267 billion, we ought to be able to find \$1.3 billion to support education and support dislocated workers and support job training and support summer youth jobs. I think I speak for the vast majority of the people in the country.

Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my time. I also ask unanimous consent to add Senator PELL as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, there are other colleagues who mentioned to me that they wanted to speak on the amendment. They have been trying to get down, so I am reluctant to give up all of the time. I wonder if Senators on the other side want to speak, or should we go into a quorum call?

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that if any Members want to speak on this amendment, now is the time. We do not want to stay here days and days when we can finish this bill in a reasonable time. I hope they will come to the floor. Those who are watching on television, if their staffs are watching on television, get

the Senators here to present their amendments so we can proceed and make progress on this bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask it to be charged equally to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I now yield to the able Senator from New Mexico 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand full well Senator WELLSTONE's sentiment with reference to other programs of the Federal Government besides defense. I even understand how he specifically would like more money spent in other areas. But I would like the Senate to know that this Wellstone amendment is just a clever effort to avoid a point of order.

But before I make that case, let me say the Senate has spoken, not once, not twice, but, if I count correctly, one, two, three, four, five—has voted five times during this particular year to deny further restraints on defense spending.

When the budget resolution came before the Senate, there was an effort to reduce it by \$8 billion. It lost. We had an opportunity for the U.S. Senate to speak its piece on this issue and make up its mind what it wanted to do on behalf of the defense of our country. We had another vote. Senator BUMPERS, on that same resolution, attempted to remove the firewall. That lost. In fact, it lost by a rather significant margin.

The firewall speaks most to this issue because what we have decided in the U.S. Congress—and the U.S. Senate has led that—we do not want to put the defense of our country into competition with all of the social welfare programs of our Nation, however good they may be; that we do not want the appropriators, as much as we respect them and give them the jurisdiction over spending the money, we do not want them to put additional needs of some social welfare program up against defense and say, "Let's cut defense this year and use it on these other programs." That is why we put up a firewall.

The firewall is simple yet profound. Do not put the defense of our Nation under that kind of pressure on individual votes here in the U.S. Congress. If, in fact, you want to reduce defense, do it on a straight vote to reduce defense and then put the savings on the deficit so you are not tempted to try to reduce defense, perhaps beyond what it ought to be reduced, in favor of paying for some social welfare program that

maybe even everybody in the Senate might support. That is two times we voted.

Then we voted final passage of the budget resolution. It passed with a defense number in it that is just slightly different from the total authorization in this bill. Now, that is three times that the Senate would have spoken under the proposition that when you vote you mean what you say.

Then we went to conference and we came back. In conference, the House agreed to the defense number of the Senate. The Senate voted again and said that is what we want to do this year. In that was this firewall, saying, "Don't put the social welfare structure of our Nation in competition with the defense money needed for our national defense and the men and women who are supporting us in all the various ways that we have to help them in that effort in a defense authorization bill."

Then, Senator WELLSTONE comes and wants to take \$13 billion out of defense, and that is turned down by the U.S. Senate. Later today, we will vote on an EXON amendment which would reduce the defense spending by \$4 billion. My suspicion is that will get turned down.

Now, what we have is an amendment that says the Secretary of Defense—can you imagine, the Secretary of Defense—is going to be given the authority to transfer \$1.3 billion of defense money to the Secretaries of Education and Labor. Now, how can we have something that is more in defiance of what we have already voted to support, which is this firewall between the domestic programs and the defense programs, than this circuitous way of getting around those firewalls?

If this were a Department of Defense appropriations bill, Mr. President, this amendment would clearly be in violation of the firewalls and would be subject to a point of order and require 60 votes. We did that in the budget this year, last year, and the year before, and on previous occasions because we meant business about not taking money out of defense every time we thought a program in the nondefense area needed more money.

Now, this is just an attempt to rewrite what we have already decided. Everybody should understand that for what it is. Unfortunately, fellow Senators, because this is an authorization bill and because of some clever drafting, this amendment is not subject to a point of order, but it does great harm and violence to the firewall concept which I have described now on four different occasions in the few minutes I have been before the Senate and why it is important and why we have stood for it on a number of occasions with up-or-down votes on the side of, "Don't compete between domestic and defense," on the floor of the Senate.

It should be known for what it is: A clear attempt to violate the firewall. This amendment would also, in my opinion, make very bad law. Do we want to authorize education and labor

programs in a Department of Defense bill? Do we want to make the Secretary of Defense responsible for authorizing or not of PELL grants? In my opinion, not only does this not make sense; it has the potential as a precedent for doing great harm to our ability to defend our Nation. This amendment is an artful attempt to violate the firewalls that Congress has already adopted. I repeat, in addition, it makes very little sense to adopt a budget resolution, adopt firewalls, come to the Senate floor debating a defense authorization bill that is still subject to appropriations, and have an amendment that says the Secretary has the discretion to transfer money from defense to education or to the Labor Department of the U.S. Government.

I do not know the pleasure of the managers, whether they will table or let this amendment be voted up or down. I believe we ought to let it have an up-or-down vote because I think we ought to speak very loudly and very clearly that we do not change our mind on something as important as defense and establish new precedence, in new ways, to have other programs compete with it just on a basis of who gets down here with what kind of clever amendment speaking to some kind of emotional need in an emotional way about something that is needed in our country.

I will not deny if we had all the money in the world, we might spend money on some of the things that my friend, Senator WELLSTONE, is talking about and perhaps spend more than we will on this budget resolution and appropriations, but I believe to do it this way defies common sense and it just should not be done and the Senate should send a very loud signal that this is what it is doing. It is not just trying to fund education and labor, it is trying to, in a round about way, destroy a concept that has been in place, supported by a majority of the Senate, for a very valid reason. Do not place the social welfare programs, heads-up, in competition for the defense spending of this Government once you have established the priorities by vote of the U.S. Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). The Senator from Minnesota

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliments of my colleague from New Mexico about how cleverly designed this amendment and how creative this amendment is. I say to my colleague that since we are authorizing initially \$13 billion and soon over \$11 billion more than the Secretary of Defense requested, it seems to me only appropriate that the Secretary of Defense might be given the opportunity to, in fact, say, "Yes, we did not ask for it, and we do not need it, and as the Secretary of Defense, I know what is critical to the defense of this country." It is not what my colleague called social welfare programs, but an investment in education.

This amendment gives the Secretary of Defense the opportunity to say that for military readiness, for our country doing well economically, for children having opportunities, for higher education being affordable, this makes eminently good sense, to take \$1.3 billion out of \$267 billion and put it into Pell grants, put it into low-interest loans, put it into summer youth programs.

Mr. President, again, we have the comptroller writing a report saying last year in the Pentagon budget they did not even know where \$13 billion went. They did not know where it went.

Other Senators, including Senators on the Armed Services Committee, talk about all the add-ons. We know about some of these special projects. We know about some of the pork. We know about some of the accelerated spending for some of these weapons programs, some of which may very well be obsolete. Nobody is sacrificing the national defense of our country.

Ask any citizen in any cafe anywhere in the United States of America whether they think taking \$1.3 billion out of \$267 billion is some kind of a major transgression or is a step backward for our country. Ask the people in your different States, as they see their student enrollment grow in K through 12 and our commitment go down as we cut funds for kids in schools, while the enrollment grows in New Mexico, or Idaho, or Georgia, or Vermont, or Minnesota, whether they think it is unreasonable.

I do not think the amendment is just clever. I think the amendment goes to the very heart of what our priorities are. I do not think the people in our States find unreasonable the proposition that we take \$1.3 billion out of \$267 billion and put it into these priority programs, take \$1.3 billion out of the \$13 billion that the Pentagon did not even ask for, and put it into Pell grants, low-interest student loan programs, summer jobs programs, dislocated worker programs, job training programs, school-to-work programs.

I think a vote against this amendment is a vote against our national security. I think a vote against this amendment is a vote against our national defense because, surely, there is pork in this \$267 billion, surely, there is some inefficiency, surely, there is a little bit by way of add-on projects so that we can, in fact, transfer \$1.3 billion to what we say are our priorities. We all love to have photo opportunities next to young people. We all like to talk about their futures. We all like to tell them that they are the future. But when it comes to reaching into our pockets and making the investment, all of a sudden we are saying \$1.3 billion is too much. I do not think that is credible.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to commend the able Senator

from New Mexico for his timely and excellent remarks on this subject.

Mr. President, I now yield to the able Senator from Idaho such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I thank the Chair, and I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. President, let us make it very clear, this is the 12th straight year that we have seen reductions in the defense authorization bill, the spending for defense.

I appreciate my friend who is offering this amendment, and I am not going to stand here and in any way speak against the intent which may be to somehow augment education. But I will stand here steadfastly and say you must not take a dime out of this defense authorization bill. We do not have a dime that can go to anything else. We have gone too far too fast in the reductions of our defense.

When we held a hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. President, we had members of the administration testifying, including General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense, Dr. Bill Perry, who are both tremendous men. I asked General Shalikashvili about the issue of procurement, "Have we added too much money on procurement and what has our history been of that? General Shalikashvili." I asked, "let me ask you this with regard to the procurement issue, which is a very key issue. As I talk to military personnel in the field, they consider this a lifesaving situation. This current fiscal year, the Congress added \$7 billion to that account and some people regarded that as pork." I went on to say: "But, as I recall, that went for things such as trucks, helicopters, ships for the Navy and Marines, tactical aircraft for the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. Was this equipment needed, or was it congressional pork?"

General Shalikashvili responded:

I think that the vast majority of the money was against things that we were going to buy later. They were brought forward as a result of what you did and in many, probably in all, cases in the long run will result in a savings because we were able to get them sooner and probably at a more advantageous price.

I asked the Secretary of Defense:

Dr. Perry, it has been stated that we will find procurement funding increases dependent upon BRAC savings, which is the Base Realignment Commission savings, acquisition reform savings, and optimistic assumptions about low inflation. The administration found \$47 billion in the so-called defense savings by assuming inflation will be no higher than 2.3 percent over the next 7 years. Over the last 30 years, Mr. Secretary, can you point to any 7-year period where inflation remained this low?

The response of Secretary Perry: "No."

Yet, that is what we are basing this on—these assumptions. I mentioned

the Base Realignment Commission. We have already seen them lower the estimate on the savings of the Base Realignment Commission, because the savings just are not there. As we begin to see the environmental costs of cleanup, it is beginning to erode what they thought were going to be the savings. Now, that was General Shalikashvili and the Secretary of Defense.

I will tell you, Mr. President, if we had before us any of the rank and file in our military, the men and women, and asked them if we have provided congressional pork to those who are on the frontline, they would tell you in a resounding voice: Absolutely not.

I can show you, Mr. President, letters I have received from the men and women on the frontline—for example, marines on just scratch pads that had been scribbled on in the field, but yet sent to us that say, "Thank you for providing us, finally, the field jackets that are new, because we have been using the World War II field jackets in adverse conditions." Thanks for the new Kevlar or the Gortex we have been able to wear.

Mr. President, in this Nation's Capital, you see the monuments to democracy, and they are impressive. They are impressive to any visitor to this great Nation, no matter what country they may be from. As you stand on the top steps of the Lincoln Memorial and you look straight ahead to the Washington Monument, which reflects our tribute to democracy and of what this Nation is founded upon and what is the envy of the rest of the world, you cannot look at that Washington Monument without seeing the Vietnam Memorial, where etched in those stones are the names of 58,200 Americans who gave their lives for this country in the name of democracy. You cannot stand at the top of those steps and not see to the right the Korean War Memorial and the names etched of those brave Americans who gave their lives. Many of them, Mr. President, are young kids that wanted to have a future, that wanted to have an education, but all of that was denied because they put their lives on the line for this country. Directly behind the Lincoln Memorial is row upon row of the white crosses of Arlington Cemetery, which is a graphic demonstration, Mr. President, that when you look at the monuments to democracy, they were paid for by American lives, because it is not a safe world.

Have I simply referenced history and that is all behind us?

Well, the tragedy is, Mr. President, we learned that more American men and women of the service were killed in Saudi Arabia last night. Why are they there? Why are they even in Saudi Arabia? Well, because they are denying Saddam Hussein the airways because that is a terrorist—Saddam Hussein who invaded Kuwait, and America responded with its great might and it brought liberty again to that oppressed nation. Saddam Hussein—that is not a good guy.

Why is it that Red China is doing everything they conceivably can to develop a nuclear arsenal with the delivery capability? Is that for philanthropic reasons?

Is the cold war over and now we all can roll up our efforts on defense? If you do, it will be the end of America.

Why is it that North Korea is doing everything they can to develop a nuclear arsenal? Why is it that Russia, with all of the difficulties that they are currently experiencing, is still turning out state-of-the-art nuclear submarines?

Mr. President, it is a troubled world out there. And the only way that we make sure that our young men and women of this country have a future is to make sure that we defend this country by making sure that we have the adequate funds for the defense of this country. And that is how we assure them that they can go forward with the education of this Nation and have a bright future, and extend democracy throughout this great land and be that beacon of hope for the rest of the world.

But if we start drawing down again on the defense of this country we do not have a future because there are people out there that would love to topple this tremendous democracy. We must never ever let it happen. We must never ever draw our defenses so low that we are vulnerable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague.

I want to point out that this authorization was initially \$13 billion in extra military spending. Spending that was not requested by the President. That was not requested by the Secretary of Defense. And as long as we are talking about the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it was not requested by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There is not one Senator here that is talking about not having a strong defense. The question is, what are we doing spending money that is not requested by the Defense Department, by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the President, people who do not want it, and at the same time we are not allocating money for kids who need it?

In the State of Idaho, I do not remember the exact figures, the enrollment went up this past year in K-12 by about 3,000 and the State is going to be faced with a cut of about \$9.3 million.

It is not unreasonable to talk about this small transfer of funding.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to commend the able Senator from Idaho for his excellent remarks on this amendment. The Senator from Idaho is a valuable member of the Armed Services Committee. I just want to thank him, too, for the contribution that he makes on that committee and to our national defense.

Mr. President, I do not know of anyone else who wishes to speak on this

amendment. If not, I would suggest that we yield the time that is left for both sides.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will yield time if the Senator from South Carolina has yielded all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the pending amendment is set aside. And the Senate resumes amendment No. 4345.

There are 2 minutes equally divided.

The majority manager is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho started to say something.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Would it be in order for me to ask for 60 seconds to respond to what the Senator from Minnesota said?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is in order.

Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I thank all Members on the floor for allowing me that courtesy.

Again, I appreciate the vigor with which my friend from Minnesota is advocating his position in response to which I said I will tell you that there are members of the Armed Services Committee who disagree with what the budgets are requiring.

I also note that I think those men and women in uniform that are wearing the stars as general officers are good soldiers. The Commander in Chief submitted the budget, and they have to support that budget. But I will tell you they are hopeful that we will go ahead and provide the funding necessary; not the funds that were requested because they are too low.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, could I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to respond?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleagues.

Again, I do not think we are talking about any decline in the quality of life for the men and women who serve our country, or our national defense budget. We are talking about eliminating wasteful Congressional add-on projects here. We have pork projects here. Senators, we have inefficiencies. And we want to cut \$1.3 billion, or transfer \$1.3 billion, out of \$267 billion. That is all we are talking about. Nobody is talking about sacrifice for the men and women that sacrifice for our country. That much is clear.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I understand the time is yielded on both sides on this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4345

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The pending amendment now is amendment No. 4345 with 1 minute to each side.

Mr. THURMOND. Senator EXON is here now.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank you. I thank my friend from South Carolina.

We have debated this very thoroughly. Basically what the Exon amendment does is a very modest decrease in the amount authorized in the defense authorization bill. Basically what we are talking about here, Mr. President, is simply that the defense committee came up with \$13 billion over and above the President and the Pentagon which is being cut by the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Georgia, down to \$11.4. They had to do that anyway because that was the amount included in the budget resolution.

The Exon amendment still allows \$9 billion over and above what the Pentagon and the President wants. It is a \$2.4 billion decrease only beyond what the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee recognize and realize is needed. I hope that we will be fiscally responsible and recognize that, with the cuts that we are making across the board, we have to nick just a little bit the defense bill as well.

I hope the Exon, et al., amendment will receive solid support of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority manager is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Exon amendment would cut \$4 billion. That is no little amount of money. That is a lot of money—a \$4 billion cut out of our defense. The military chiefs say we need to modernize. We especially need to do more procurement, more ships, more planes, modern weapons, and tanks.

How can we do it if you are going to go and cut defense now below what is recommended? We cannot afford this.

I would ask that this amendment be voted against, and at this time I will now yield to the ranking member.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, how much time would I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 18 seconds.

Mr. NUNN. Eighteen seconds. I must say there is nothing the Senator from Nebraska ever does that could be described as modest. Everything he does is important. This is an important amendment that should be defeated because it makes a substantial reduction in the modernization accounts which are desperately needed in defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the Exon amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Feingold	Lautenberg
Baucus	Ford	Leahy
Biden	Glenn	Levin
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Gregg	Moynihan
Brown	Harkin	Murray
Bryan	Hatfield	Pell
Bumpers	Hollings	Pryor
Byrd	Jeffords	Reid
Conrad	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerrey	Simon
Dorgan	Kerry	Wellstone
Exon	Kohl	Wyden

NAYS—55

Abraham	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Nunn
Bond	Grams	Pressler
Breaux	Hatch	Robb
Burns	Heflin	Roth
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Simpson
Cochran	Inouye	Smith
Cohen	Johnston	Snowe
Coverdell	Kemphorne	Specter
Craig	Kyl	Stevens
D'Amato	Lieberman	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner
Feinstein	McCain	
Frahm	McConnell	

The amendment (No. 4345) was rejected.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. D'AMATO. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two additional votes in the vote sequence be reduced to 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4346

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is amendment No. 4346. Each side has 1 minute.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I know the Senator from South Carolina is going to want to speak on this. I will speak very briefly.

This amendment would reduce the pending bill to the total in the budget resolution. It would bring it in full compliance with the budget resolution. It is a reduction of \$1.7 billion.

I urge our colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Thurmond-Nunn amendment would cut \$1.7 billion. We are asking for the same amount here to be cut as the Budget Committee has found. Senator DOMENICI recommended this amount in his committee, \$1.7 billion, and we advocate cutting \$1.7 billion out of this bill. That is our amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 4346. The yeas and nays have

been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Ford	Mack
Akaka	Frahm	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Bradley	Gregg	Nunn
Breaux	Harkin	Pell
Brown	Hatch	Pressler
Bryan	Hatfield	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Burns	Helms	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inhofe	Santorum
Coats	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Cohen	Johnston	Simon
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simpson
Coverdell	Kemphorne	Smith
Craig	Kennedy	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerrey	Specter
Daschle	Kerry	Stevens
DeWine	Kohl	Thomas
Dodd	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dorgan	Leahy	Warner
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lieberman	Wyden
Feingold	Lott	
Feinstein	Lugar	

The amendment (No. 4346) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4347

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 4347. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, is there any debate time on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided, 1 minute per side.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I do not see the chairman on the floor. I suggest that Senator DOMENICI, the Senator from New Mexico, handle the opposition to this amendment. And I agree with every word he is likely to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have now voted eight different times to keep the defense number intact. On the last occasion we made it comply with the budget resolution, so we all agreed with that.

What Senator WELLSTONE chooses to do is to take our votes where we have said we did not want to take money out of the defense, and he suggests that we should get rid of the firewalls, which we voted to keep in place by giving the Secretary of Defense the authority to appropriate \$1.3 billion for education, and other welfare programs.

The reason we have had firewalls is because we do not want to put the defense of our Nation into competition with other social welfare and education programs that very well could need money. In this case, it is a roundabout way of destroying the firewalls, and it ought to be denied because we voted twice to maintain them. This is a roundabout way to deny and defeat what we have already voted for. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I move to table.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is out of order. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, first of all, this gives the Secretary of Defense the opportunity to do this. It is not a violation of any firewall. There is no budget point of order. This is \$1.3 billion. The reason it does not is because this is out of \$267 billion. This is out of \$13 billion, now \$11 billion more than the Pentagon wanted.

It is simple. Do you spend the money on some of the add-on projects, some of what is not needed, or do you spend the money on higher education, Pell grants, student loans? It is a simple choice. It is hardly what I would call welfare in a pejorative sense. It is all about whether or not we are going to restore some of this funding up to the President's request level for higher education and opportunities for young people.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 40, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Abraham	Ford	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frahm	Mack
Bennett	Frist	McCain
Biden	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Nunn
Burns	Gregg	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Robb
Chafee	Heflin	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Cohen	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Inouye	Smith
Craig	Johnston	Snowe
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kemphorne	Thomas
Dodd	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lieberman	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Warner

NAYS—40

Akaka	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hatfield	Pell
Bradley	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Jeffords	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 4347) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NUNN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, what is the regular order, the pending business?

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 8:15 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:34 p.m., adjourned until 8:15 a.m., Thursday, June 27, 1996.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26, 1996:

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

PAUL P. BLACKBURN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARILYN MCAFEE, OF FLORIDA
CYNTHIA JANE MILLER, OF TEXAS
ANNE M. SIGMUND, OF KANSAS

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

CHARLES MILLER CROUCH, OF CONNECTICUT
PETER CHARLES DESHAZO, OF FLORIDA
RICHARD ANDREW VIRDEN, OF MINNESOTA
E. ASHLEY WILLS, OF TEXAS